

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-20 have been cancelled, and new claims 21-33 are added. Accordingly, claims 21-33 are now pending in the application.

Claims 5, 10, 11-13 and 18-20 are objected to because the reference numbers do not appear to be associated with any particular structure and are not in parenthesis. In response, new claim 29 corresponds to cancelled claims 5 and 11-13. Claim 10 has been cancelled. New claim 23 corresponds to cancelled claims 18-20. New claims 23 and 29 do not include any reference number. Accordingly, the objections to claims 5, 10, 11-13 and 18-20 should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, claims 5 and 11-13 are rejected because of the phrase "involving jaws." In response, new claim 29 has been added, which corresponds to cancelled claims 5 and 11-13. Claim 29 does not include the phrase "involving." Accordingly, new claim 29 is believed to be definite, and the indefiniteness rejection of claims 5 and 11-13 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Isachsen* (US 1730077). In response, claim 1 is cancelled, and new independent claim 21 corresponds to cancelled claim 1. Claim 21 is believed to be patentable over *Isachsen* for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 21 claims a device for positioning and securing a relatively small weapon like a mortar carried (and not towed) by a vehicle, unloading easily the weapon down from the rear platform of the vehicle (operating successively the two arms of the crane), easily placing the weapon at the appropriate position spaced from the vehicle (relaxing the flexible link), and after use, loading the weapon back on the vehicle (retracting the

flexible link and operating the two arms of the crane). The device comprises a retractable interface and a crane made with two arms.

Claim 21 includes the limitation, "lifting means for unloading the weapon down on the ground from the vehicle and to put the weapon back on the vehicle", which is not disclosed, taught or suggested by *Isachsen*.

Claim 21 recites "an interface configured to connect said lifting means and said weapon, the interface comprising a retractable structure having a short rigid connection allowing the weapon to be load on the vehicle and to put the weapon down on the ground when the retractable structure retracts and a loose connection allowing the weapon to move relatively to the vehicle when the retractable structure is relaxed, while keeping a link between the weapon and the carrying vehicle," which is not disclosed by *Isachsen*. *Isachsen* discloses a coupling assembly for vehicle trailers. However, *Isachsen* does not teach or suggest "a retractable structure having a short rigid connection allowing the weapon to be load on the vehicle and to put the weapon down on the ground when the retractable structure retracts and a loose connection allowing the weapon to move relatively to the vehicle when the retractable structure is relaxed."

Furthermore, *Isachsen* fails to disclose "lifting means being configured so as to remove the weapon from the vehicle before lifting it down and to position the weapon on the vehicle after lifting it up."

Based on the above reasons, *Isachsen* fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 21. Accordingly, the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

New dependent claims 22, 24, 25 and 29 correspond to cancelled claims 2, 3, 4 and 5. Claims 22, 24, 25 and 29 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 21 as well as on their own merits.

New dependent claim 22 also corresponds to cancelled claim 7. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 10 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 9 and 10 are now deemed moot.

New dependent claim 29 also corresponds to cancelled claims 11-13. As stated above, claim 29 recites additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 21 as well as on its own merits. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 11-13 should be withdrawn.

New dependent claim 23 corresponds to cancelled claims 18-20. Claim 23 recites additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 21 as well as on its own merits. According, the rejection of claims 18-20 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Broziat* (US 3285445). Claim 8 has been cancelled, and the rejection of claim 8 is now deemed moot. New claim 21 corresponds to previous claim 1 and is believed patentable over *Broziat* for the reasons discussed below.

*Broziat* discloses a mobile crane. However, the mobile crane can not unload the weapon down on the ground from the vehicle and put the weapon back on the vehicle. Therefore, *Broziat* fails to disclose the limitation of claim 21, "lifting means for unloading the weapon down on the ground from the vehicle and putting the weapon back on the vehicle."

In addition, *Broziat* also fails to disclose "an interface configured to connect said lifting means and said weapon, the interface comprising a retractable structure having a short rigid connection allowing the weapon to be load on the vehicle and to put the weapon down on the ground when the retractable structure retracts and a loose connection allowing the weapon to move relatively to the vehicle when the retractable structure is relaxed, while keeping a link between the weapon and the carrying vehicle," and "lifting means being configured so as to remove the weapon from the vehicle before lifting it down and to position the weapon on the vehicle after lifting it up."

Based on the above reasons, *Broziat* fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim

21. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 over *Broziat* should be withdrawn

New claims 22, 24 correspond to cancelled claims 2, 3. As stated above, claims 22 and 24 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 21 as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2, 3 should be withdrawn.

The limitations of claims 6 has been incorporated into new claim 22, and claim 6 has been cancelled. Thus, the rejection of claim 6 is now deemed moot.

Claims 14, 15 and 17 recite similar limitations as claim 6. The rejection of claims 14, 15 and 17 are now deemed moot.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Broziat* in view of *Van Doorne* (US 2746586). Claim 16 recites similar limitations as cancelled claim 6. As stated above, the limitations recited in claim 6 have been incorporated into new independent claim 21. Accordingly, the rejection to claim 16 should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP**



Kenneth M. Berner  
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
**Date: July 8, 2008**  
**KMB/SY/cac**